



SCHOOL OF LAW
CASE WESTERN RESERVE
UNIVERSITY

Case Western Reserve University
School of Law Scholarly Commons


Center for Professional Ethics

Law School Publications

Center for Professional Ethics, Volume 1, Issue 2, 1999

Case Western Reserve University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/professional_ethics

 Part of the [Applied Ethics Commons](#), [Bioethics and Medical Ethics Commons](#), [Business Law, Public Responsibility, and Ethics Commons](#), and the [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#)

Scholarly Commons Citation

Case Western Reserve University, "Center for Professional Ethics, Volume 1, Issue 2, 1999."
https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/professional_ethics/28

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School Publications at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Center for Professional Ethics by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

AT CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

SPRING 1999

VOLUME 1, Number 2

Panel Meets to Discuss Hate Crime Legislation

IN THIS ISSUE:

Hate Crimes.....1

Voices of Diversity.....4

**Director's Corner:
Distractions &
the Good Society.....5**

**Tom Anderson on
Leadership Ethics.....6**

**Professor Jean
Bethke Elshtain.....8**

News and Notes.....10

**"The only reward
of virtue is virtue;
the only way to
have a friend is to
be one."**

--- Ralph Waldo Emerson

"Legislating Against Hate: Promoting Tolerance or Inhibiting Freedom?", a discussion sponsored by the Center for Professional Ethics and the CWRU Share the Vision Committee, gathered students, faculty and staff to discuss hate crime legislation. Bob Lawry, the Director of the Center for Professional Ethics and Professor of Law, served as the moderator on the panel, which consisted of Jonathan Entin, Professor, CWRU School of Law; Glenn Nicholls, Vice President, University Office of Student Affairs; G. Dean Patterson, Asst. Vice Pres., University Office of Student Affairs; Jes Sellers, Director, University Counseling Services, as well as Barbara Krasner and Caroline Whitbeck, both professors in the Philosophy Department and members and fellows of the Center for Professional Ethics.

Professor Lawry opened the discussion with explaining that "hate crime legislation has to with

passage of specialized kinds of laws that would increase the penalty attached to what is otherwise an ordinary crime. The crime would have to be committed against one or more persons within a certain group of people because of hatred of that particular group." Professor Lawry cited a line in a New York Times editorial which stated, "The need for hate crimes laws is obvious." He then posed that question to the panel and the group. "Do you think the need for hate crime laws obvious?"

"I don't think legislating hate crimes is going to get us anywhere closer to solving the problem," replied Professor Krasner. "It doesn't address the real issues behind the hate crimes [which is] the racism, sexism and homophobia or pick your other social ill. It's just going to try to placate people. [However] it may be able to bring attention to the problem....if education is the answer, we need to get out there and address these issues."

continued on page 2

HATE CRIMES

continued from page 1

Mr. Sellers stated, "I am actually in favor of it, but I am not sure what the outcome will be. I think the process of moving towards laws like this can help us, and help groups, tolerate diversity." He asked the audience what year this country recognize universal suffrage. As the audience gave an array of answers, he replied, "It may not exist yet." He also noted the importance of taking a "look at the psychological and the psycho-social aspects of hatred."

In a similar vein, Mr. Patterson added, "Enacting more laws just to enact them isn't the answer." He mentioned the importance of values being taught by the family. "It's where your values come from," he reminded the group.

An audience member wondered what would be the point of having hate crime legislation if you don't want to say a hate crime has been committed against you.

Professor Entin addressed this by saying, "There is federal legislation pending now, in both houses of congress which deals with people who willfully cause bodily injury to any person on the basis of the actual or perceived race, color, religion or national origin of

a person." He added, "Even if this law went on the books, it still wouldn't have helped with the Matthew Shepard situation because that's not why he was murdered. Hate crimes law doesn't deal with day to day issues [like discrimination] in employment and housing."

At this point, Professor Lawry remarked that both the panel and the audience were sharing the view that these laws could be "Okay...but [there is more]."

Audience members wondered about enhancing criminal sentencing in regard to hate crimes and the accompanying issue of prosecutors being out to "get" someone.

"The Supreme Court has said you can enhance a criminal sentence where the motivation is race-based; but it is worth keeping in mind that the case in which this happened did not involve an attack on African-Americans. It involved an attack on whites by African Americans," responded Professor Entin. "One concern that some people could have is that because there is so much discretion built into the system, a symbolic measure or legislation designed to protect minorities, may in fact wind up being used against them." He added, "Keep

THE CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

at C.W.R.U

Robert P. Lawry
Director

Jeanmarie Gielty
Department Assistant and Editor

The Center for Professional Ethics at Case Western Reserve University provides opportunities for students, faculty, administrators and professionals to explore more fully the foundations of personal and professional ethics.

We encourage you to join. Please fill out the form on the back page of the newsletter.

in mind that these laws are written in a general way that will allow a certain amount of discretion, and it might not have the impact people are hoping for."

Professor Krasner brought up the issue of fragmentation in our society. "If we lived in a nice, little homogenous society, I would really like laws about assault to be about assault; [and that would be the case] if we lived in a society where everyone really is an equal individual or treated like an equal individual. But we don't live in a society like that." She further

delved into this point by saying, "If you want to talk about someone's intentionality in a violent act, then we have to talk about what we mean by violence, and if we expand the notice of violence, then we need to look at all the other forms of hatred."

Professor Lawry then asked Glenn Nicholls, the Vice President of University Office of Student Affairs what rules of conduct may or may not exist on this college campus. He added to that question an incident that happened after the murder of Matthew Shepard. "After the slaying there was a parade during which an effigy of the slain student was hung. If something like this happened at Case — does it

committed to the open and free exchange of ideas; and in that the exchange of those ideas, we are going to disagree with one another and we are going to express opinions that we will share or won't share." Mr. Nicholls added, "The debate that is fostered by that collision of ideas is fundamental to [learning], not only in the classroom, but on the rest of the campus [as well]. Speech in and of itself, needs to be protected in our rules. On the other hand, speech in a certain context can be harassment and there is speech that is threatening; threats can be treated as a negative behavior." He concluded, "That's the point with which I would start following up with determining what's happening, who is saying

what, and whether or not that speech represents an opinion or an idea, or rather, whether it constitutes a threat."

Professor Whitbeck brought up the point that "the

emphasis on free speech in the United States is distinct, and it's quite peculiar to the United States." She also noted, "[Free speech] it is not necessary for the mission of a university in a tech-

nologically-civilized democracy; you may want it, but it's not necessary." To this, Professor Entin added, "[Free speech] does not apply on this campus [because] we are a private university. The first amendment in its own terms applies only to actions undertaken by government, not private parties." He mentioned that "universities have their own commitments to the free exchange of ideas, so [universities] have traditionally taken a very strong line on free speech, both because it has intrinsic value and because it is in the university's best interest."

Professor Entin circled back to the question of harassment. "The courts, traditionally have said, that speech that fits into the category of harassment can therefore be punished, [but it] has to be face to face." He noted that there are legal ways of demonstrating disapproval with what he terms "obnoxious speech."

"Jackson, Tennessee, the place where the Klu Klux Klan supposedly got its start, [was faced with the issue of] the Klan wanting to have a march to celebrate its anniversary. The town knew they couldn't ban the parade...what happened instead is that every business on Jackson's main street closed and the people put signs and ribbons along the street to

"This is to say that as a community we ought to try make clear that the remedy for bad speech isn't suppression, it's good speech."

break the rules? What would you do as vice president?"

"The answer to that, as always, is it depends," replied Mr. Nicholls. "There is a fundamentally important principle on this campus. It is

continued on page 4

make clear that while the Klan had the legal right to say what they had to say, it didn't mean that the town would acquiesce by its silence in the views that the Klan had." He remarked, "This is to say that as a community we ought to try to make clear that the remedy for bad speech isn't suppression, it's good speech. I think that puts an obligation on the rest of us, to do things to make clear that we are isolating the people who have obnoxious ideas." But then he warned against the over-regulating of bad speech, yet not to passively stand by when one hears it.

Professor Lawry then asked the panel and the audience, "What can we do about it?"

"We can only go so far with rights and rules," answered Professor

Whitbeck, "but to really make a community work everybody, or at least most people, have to be thinking, not just of their own actions — you also have to 'get it' about what's going on with other people. You have to know how to exercise discretion and not push your luck. You cut someone a little slack, you don't press all of your rights all of the time or the community breaks down."

Mr. Nicholls added that the CWRU Share the Vision Committee is what this [issue] is about. "When there has been conflict we have been able to at least talk about it," he said. Professor Krasner noted that while teaching the dialogue skills is necessary, "the harder step is once you open those skills, not to close the dialogue. [For example], if

someone asks an uncomfortable questions or wants to bring an uncomfortable speaker in. What is important is the process. The process is, I think, a very precious gift we can give each other."

Professor Lawry added, "The liberal tradition is that there is a fine line to draw, [as in] 'Well, we stand for these things and if you don't stand for these things you aren't welcome.' But I do think we need to stand for SOME things, and I think these things have been mentioned: open-mindedness, respect for people, toleration of others' views, a willingness to engage in respectful conversation with people we do not agree with; I think we do have to stand for those things — if we don't stand for those things, then I expect that we are all in trouble." □

Voices of Diversity

The Center for Professional Ethics and the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences are co-sponsoring "Voices of Diversity," a project designed to promote social justice and health care reform through drama and discussion programs.

Marvin Rosenberg, associate professor of social work at the Mandel School and an experienced actor, developed Voices of Diversity. The project features presentations of excerpts from two award-winning plays, "I'm Not Rappaport" and "Cold Storage," followed by group discussions with audiences. The presentations are targeted to health and human services organizations.

The two plays, which are performed by local professional actors, stimulate discussion of issues such as death and dying, health care costs, racism and intergenerational conflict.

The project is receiving funding from the Harry K. Fox and Emma R. Fox Charitable Foundation, the Mt. Sinai Health Care Foundation, and the Eleanor Gerson Supporting Foundation. For additional information, contact Darlene Rebello-Rao at (216) 297-1884 or dxr2@po.cwru.edu. □

Distraction & the Good Society

As we waywardly dropped our lethal bombs on the deserts and the people of Iraq some weeks ago, I went cold with fright. Our political leaders and omnipresent media temporarily halted their dumb show about sex and scandal, to come together briefly in a rare display of patriotic unity. There were one or two snide remarks that President Clinton had ordered the attack to deliberately distract the nation from his own domestic woes.

Few, however, accepted the "Wag the Dog" theory. Almost every public official agreed that the President had no choice. Hadn't the United States clearly warned Saddam Hussein? What was the last, lone superpower to do – back down?

Now, think about this state of affairs. War-like acts are a distraction from sex and scandal? So what is the sex and scandal obsession? A distraction, I suggest, from all serious public issues that need and deserve careful, thoughtful attention. It has been this way in our republic for too long. We have no sense as a nation, of the relative proportionality of things. We have no sense of what to concentrate public thought and examination upon. Moreover, we have no habit of

public discourse any longer, which might enable us to debate these deeply troubling matters. All is partisanship, rancor, titillation.

The matter is worse than a lack of judgment and a lack of a viable public discourse – serious as those two problems are. What is missing is a lack of political will to examine judgment and discourse. What is also holding us back is a set of assumptions about who we are as a people and how our institutions work, or ought to work.

Earlier in this decade, a group of sociologists, headed by Robert Bullah, produced a book entitled The Good Society. Building on their earlier work in the much-acclaimed Habits of the Heart, the authors examined many large social institutions and found them sorely lacking. They called for some serious public attention to examining our patterns of behavior and the assumptions that lay behind them. We are a people who have become over-committed to work and profit to the detriment of family and our moral health. We are so individualistic that we have lost a sense of community that alone can nurture us. Getting at the heart of these problems is a daunting undertak-

ing. Much of The Good Society is analytical and critical. It is short on prescription or strategy. Nevertheless, it is a place to start. Maybe we should drop bombs on Iraq whenever Saddam Hussein misbehaves. Maybe the Lewinsky affair is a sufficient reason to halt almost all action on any number of serious public concerns, like health care policy, campaign finance, Social Security – all of which have been on the agenda of the last two congressional sessions. Maybe. My belief is that we are too complacent, too easily distracted from giving attention to what truly, deeply ails us. Is there a larger moral issue here?

I believe there is, only it will not be resolved by pointing the finger at one person or one group, as if blaming is the start and finish of the moral life. We need to look in two, radically different places to begin to find a way out. We need to look at all of our institutions to discern patterns and assumptions that thwart our flourishing in community. And we need to look deeply into our own hearts to make them attentive to what is truly good for all of us. ☐

ETHICS IN LEADERSHIP

Thomas W. Anderson, ethics fellow at the Center for Professional Ethics, gave a speech titled "Ethics in Leadership" at the October 1998 installment of the Ethics Fellows dinners. He explained that this talk was one that he normally gave to nonprofit administrators — however, he decided to give the talk this evening because he was interested in getting a faculty reaction. "[The speech is normally] for a group of people who are managers; administrators who are leaders of nonprofit institutions, small to large, but mostly small [institutions]. These are folks who are in the trenches everyday, [people] who are living the case studies that I have used in my class," he told the group.

Mr. Anderson began with a story that took place in 1985. At the California Institute of Technology, he had been at the premiere of the PBS movie that detailed the struggle and story of the Tuskegee Airmen. Mr. Anderson explained that the Tuskegee Airmen were a "World War II division of black pilots who faced towering bigotry and the most offensive forms of discrimination." The movie was attended by the director, the producer, the staff, crew and the stars. However, the most important attendees were

Tuskegee Airmen veterans themselves. Mr. Anderson continued, "These pilots, despite overwhelming obstacles performed impeccably. Their service and heroism were largely

"Leadership is a shared, communal activity among all members of a group, leadership is not a position, title or status."

ignored, both individually and collectively. This movie was an important step in naming and healing the unconscionable wounds of racism. The movie, to the Tuskegee Airmen, was a testimony to their unselfish service and the thanks they did not receive at the end of the war. For many, this evening was the fulfillment of a lifelong dream."

Mr. Anderson told of an elderly gentlemen who approached the Lt. General representing the Air Force at this movie premiere. The seemingly weak, elderly man told the General that he had served with Tuskegee Airmen in World War II. Immediately, the General saluted him and treated

as a hero. In turn, the elderly veteran walked away from that premiere feeling honored and looking renewed and invigorated.

Mr. Anderson started his speech by defining ethics in leadership. "Ethics in leadership or leadership ethics, which is a term I borrowed from Professor Anne Ciulla, is defined in very practical terms: the study of ethical issues related to leadership and the ethics of leadership. I want to suggest that leadership ethics has special meaning and is a special responsibility for those of us in the nonprofit sector," he said. Adding to this, Mr.

Anderson noted that "leadership ethics moves beyond the question 'what is leadership' and to the real point 'what is good leadership'. Good in the leadership context is both morally good and technically good with technically being defined as competent or effective." "Therefore," he said, "a technically incompetent leader who is moral is still incompetent, and an immoral leader who is competent is still immoral." He concluded, "A good leader is both moral and competent."

Mr. Anderson reminded the group that American society, like all societies, is in many states of many transitions. "One of the several transitions of 20th century

is the change from a predominantly white, Protestant culture to a multicultural society," he said. "[This society] will, most likely, never again produce one single set of values or mores. [It is indisputable] we will become or, frankly, already are, a very diverse and sometimes fractious nation."

Mr. Anderson also observed that "cultural values have been in a state of transition since the dawning of time, and while talk show hosts, conservative politicians, religious leaders and cocktail party participants may decry the decline in morality, the fact is, the state of shared cultural values is always in a state of regeneration and decay." Along with this observation, he noted that "in periods of major cultural shifts in values, the moral discourse has a way of being conducted at the extremes."

Mr. Anderson continued in this vein by looking at both ends of the spectrum in regard to leadership. "The cynical secularists seem to have no moral expectations of leaders. [The cynical secularists seem to think] 'if the economy is good and we aren't at war, what's the problem' while political and religious fundamentalists seem to have unrealistic moral expectations of leaders—I think of this as the Mother Theresa leadership model. Both

of these positions are often close to absolutes and become conversation stoppers. How does one engage in moral discourse when moral expectations are off the table? Conversely, it is difficult to engage in a serious moral discussion with someone who possesses absolute moral truth and whose mission is the imposition of that truth on the rest of society." He concluded, "These are neither satisfying nor productive engagements."

"The trick, it seems to me, is to move the discourse and our expectations back into the broad, middle range, [which is] where most of live, morally," he explained. According to Mr. Anderson, "we are under a general moral code most of the time, but we are not perfect. We try hard to respect the diversity of our society, to appreciate and honor the values and cultures that are different from our own [while] maintaining the hope and expectation that we will have leaders who are exemplary, who inspire, who stand for something, and [finally], who help us set and achieve goals."

"As we think about the kind of leaders we'd like to have, we increasingly recognize leadership as a relationship between leaders and followers," said Professor Anderson. "Leadership is a

shared, communal activity among all members of a group. Leadership is not a position, title or status." More importantly, Professor Anderson pointed out that what distinguishes leaders from followers is not intelligence, character, ethical behavior or judgment, it is the role they are playing at a particular point in time. "Effective followers and effective leaders are often exactly the same people," he explained. "They are simply playing different roles at different times of the day or the week or the month." In the nonprofit sector, the responsibility to model ethical behavior is one that everyone must assume," alerted Mr. Anderson, "whether we see ourselves as leaders or followers, or more realistically, as both."

Aristotle, in Nichomachean Ethics, suggested that morality cannot be learned simply by reading a book on virtue, he stated. "The spirit of morality, for Aristotle, is awakened in individuals through witnessing the conduct of a moral person. Today, we call this role-modeling and mentoring; these are terms that have a familiar ring to them and are experiences we've all had, both positive and negative." "Leaders," Professor Anderson illustrated, "and we are all leaders at one time or another, [should] communicate the ethics

continued on page 8

Jean Bethke Elshtain Addresses CWRU

As the Frank J. Battisti Memorial Lecturer of 1998, Professor Jean Bethke Elshtain, University of Chicago help to show the connections between our political, religious and ethical convictions in a lecture titled "How Should We Talk? Religion & Civic Discourse" on September 17, 1998. In a powerful speech, Professor Elshtain spoke about the difficult marriage of politics and religion and the need for careful mixing of these components in today's pluralistic society.

In her hour long lecture she managed to cite Camus, Pope John Paul II, and Martin Luther King, Jr. to better explain the importance of religious beliefs while emphasizing the necessity of keeping the separation of church and state.

The next day, she addressed a smaller group in the less formal

environment of a breakfast discussion at CWRU's School of Law. The students and faculty asked a variety of questions which Professor Elshtain

Professor Elshtain has written several books. Here are three of her most recent:

Democracy on Trial (Basic Books, 1995)

Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought (Princeton University Press, 1981; second edition, 1992)

Meditations on Modern Political Thought (Praeger, 1986; reissued by Penn State Press, 1992)

answered in her trademark vivacious and challenging manner.

In an answer to a question regarding laws and courts, Professor Elshtain responded, "People think courts and the government are two separate

things -- when courts are really just an arm of the government."

Continuing in the same vein, she addressed the litigious nature of our society. "We as a people are getting lazy. We keep going to the courts to settle things. There is another way to solve problems: organize politically, and if that doesn't happen, we are all going to be in big trouble," she said.

An attendee asked her opinion on school vouchers. "The public says, 'we want vouchers' and I think we need to retain a commitment to public schools. Generations of immigrants learned English in public schools," she stated.

In the end, Professor Elshtain stressed the same point that she did in her lecture a day earlier. "[What we need in our society] is not just diversity on the level of groups, but diversity on the level of certain sorts of ideals."

Leadership

continued from page 7

of the organization and establish the standards of the workplace." Conversely, he added, "Followers, and we are all followers at one time or another, do not unreflectively absorb the mores of the workplace." "Nevertheless," he concluded, "while followers and leaders share responsibility

for the overall conduct and culture of the organization, it would be naïve to think followers are unaffected by the modeling of the leaders." Again, Mr. Anderson circled back to this issue being uniquely important to those in the nonprofit sector, "because our organizations and by extension, all of us, are entirely dependent on the trust of the American public for

our existence," he said. "Trust is the foundation of our existence; trust is the combination of integrity and honesty. Trust is foundational to the definition of applied ethics and is the essence of the nonprofit community."

"Trust," Mr. Anderson added, "is a value that cuts across even the most diverse society, and we in

continued on page 9

Leadership

continued from page 8

the nonprofit sector have a duty to not only practice and exhibit ethical behavior for the sake of our organizations, but perhaps as a model for the larger society." This, according to Tom Anderson, is leadership ethics, or where ethics lies at the heart of leadership.

In addition to this theory, Mr. Anderson spoke of "no leaders being appointed without first having exhibited a well-grounded sense of morality and a finely-tuned sense of ethical behavior." He added, "I want to be clear that I am not suggesting that nonprofit leaders... must be paragons of virtue or stiff-necked in their personal and professional lives. But having said that, I want to leave you with the conviction that good nonprofit leadership can not exist in the absence of the ethical elements of leadership."

With that, he returned to the opening story of the Tuskegee Airmen and the Lt. General of the Air Force. "I believe my story is, among other things, about leadership ethics. In the first instance, it reminds us that cultural values are rarely as absolute as they seem at the moment. Racial discrimination was an accepted American value in the 1940's and, as we all know, racial segregation was the law. Obviously, no morally sensitive person could see the movie "The Tuskegee Airman" or hear the stories of those veterans without

applauding the value changes of the last 50 years," he stated.

"Secondly, it reminds us that leadership is a role played by many, perhaps by all of us at one time or another."

"During WWII, the Tuskegee Airmen were never perceived by the military establishment or the civilian community as anything but followers in the most unsophisticated definition of that term. They were not only forced into the role of followers, but worse, they were assumed to have none of the necessary characteristics for leadership. [In reality, their division] was filled with leaders. [In addition], their leadership was often exercised under the most intolerable of conditions, and it stands today, as a testimony of the power of the human spirit [as well as] an example of leadership ethics. Lastly, Mr. Anderson believes that the story reminds us of the important relation between virtue ethics and the two major contemporary moral philosophies, formalism and consequentialism. "In short," explained Mr. Anderson, "the virtue ethics of Aristotle asks 'what sort of person should I be?' while the formalist ethics of Kant and consequentialist ethics of Mill ask 'what should I do?' What the Tuskegee Airmen did is fight a war, heroically, on the side of the very society that was discriminating against them. They did it in support of virtues that were not yet realized for people of color in the 1940's -- justice,

honor, and equality."

Mr. Anderson concluded his talk by reflecting on the behavior of the Lt. General and the similarities he has seen common in good leaders. "[In the Lt. General], I saw a profound and sensitive example of leadership ethics," he said. "I saw a leader in relationship with his followers; a leader who shared the values of the group and called everyone in the group to higher moral ground; a leader who led because he wanted to serve. Arguably, it may be easier or may be more efficient to concentrate on duties, than it is to struggle for a lifetime with the eternal question: 'what kind of human being should I be?'"

Mr. Anderson closed by saying, "If ethics in its simplest form is 'what ought to be', and leadership, in its simplest form is leaders and followers moving an organization toward shared goals, then good leadership must be as much about virtue as it is about acts and consequences; as much about people of character as it is about duties and responsibilities; as much about the daily struggle to be a good person as it is a daily struggle to do good deeds; and all of these contribute to creating ethical leaders, ethical followers and ethical organizations." ■

NEWS AND NOTES

SPRING 1999

CONFERENCES

THE 1999 COMMUNITARIAN SUMMIT

On **February 27-28, 1999**, the 1999 Communitarian Summit, an event which happens only once every five years, will be held by the Communitarian Network in conjunction with the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics.

Featuring: Authors Deborah Tannen and Francis Fukuyama; Senior Presidential Adviser Ira Magaziner; Deputy Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers; Senator Sam Brownback (R-KS); Ben Wattenberg, creator of PBS' Think Tank; and more than one hundred others! Invited speakers include Vice President Albert Gore, Jr., and Senator John McCain (R-AZ).

Themes: Communitarian perspectives on professional responsibility, personal privacy, criminal

justice, the family, education, civil society, and an examination of old and new communitarian thinking are among the many topics to be discussed at the summit. **When: February 27-28, 1999. Where: Washington, DC.**

Full conference details are available at our web site, <http://www.gwu.edu/~ccps>. To participate contact Vanessa Wight at (202) 994-9790, by fax (202) 994-1606, or by e-mail at: vwight@gwu.edu.

PAPERS

CALL FOR PAPERS: NEW JOURNALS

Ethics and Information Technology is a journal dedicated to the study of the ethical dimensions of information and communication technology.

Editors: Jeroen van den Hoven,

Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; Lucas D. Introna, London School of Economics & Political Science, UK; Deborah G. Johnson, Georgia Institute of Technology, GA, USA; Helen Nissenbaum, Princeton University, NJ, USA; Book Review Editor: Herman Tavani, Rivier College, Nashua, NH, USA.

Ethics and Information Technology is a peer-reviewed journal dedicated to advancing the dialogue between moral philosophy and the field of information and communication technology (ICT). The journal aims to foster and promote reflection and analysis which is intended to make a constructive contribution to answering the ethical, social and political questions associated with the adoption, use, and development of ICT. Within the scope of the journal are also conceptual analysis and discussion of ethical ICT issues which arise in the context of technology

assessment, cultural studies, public policy analysis and public administration, cognitive science, social and anthropological studies in technology, mass-communication, and legal studies. Research that deals with the history of ideas and provides intellectual resources for moral and political reflection on ICT is also welcomed. The general editorial policy is to publish work of high quality regardless of discipline, school of thought or philosophical tradition from which it derives. Visit <http://www.wkap.nl/> for up-to-date information.

Ethics and Justice is an interdisciplinary public affairs journal in electronic format, covering topics in applied ethics, social and criminal justice and politics. The journal is currently seeking short manuscripts for publication in future issues, especially in the areas of professional and public sector ethics (however, other topics are also welcome).

Please email manuscripts as attachments to:
editor@ethics-justice.org.

The Journal's home page is at:
www.ethics-justice.org.

A free sample copy of the journal is available by emailing:
sales@ethics-justice.org.

CLASSES

Ethics in the Profession and Practice is a five day ethics conference sponsored by the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics and hosted by the Practical Ethics Center on The University of Montana-Missoula campus. This annual summer workshop is held in early August and brings together ethics scholars and practitioners from around the globe. The conference is intended for anyone interested in practical or professional ethics - lay persons concerned about

ethics issues in society, professors eager to incorporate ethics in their courses, professionals who want to identify and explore the ethical issues they face in their professions, and faculty who are always looking for new ways of teaching and discussing ethics in their classrooms. This five-day conference meets the needs of each group and provides an opportunity for participants to associate with colleagues and professionals who share these interests. For more up to date information contact:

**Association for Practical and Professional Ethics
Indiana University
East Third Street
Bloomington, IN 47405
Phone: 812/855-6450
Fax: 812/855-3315
E-mail: Appe@indiana.edu**

CENTER FOR **P**ROFESSIONAL **E**THICS
at case western reserve university

10900 Euclid Avenue
233 Yost Hall
CWRU
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-7057

MEMBERSHIP
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

PHONE _____ SCHOOL _____

SEND TO:

Center for Professional Ethics
233 Yost Hall
CWRU
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-7057

Membership:
GENERAL \$25.00
STUDENT \$5.00